REMARKS

The Examiner objected to claims 1-4 because of informalities; rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yang ("Protocol Compatibility Tester for CDMA Mobile Systems (CMS)," IEEE, ICPWC 1996, pages 96-101) ("Yang"). Applicant hereby amends claims 1-4; voluntarily amends the drawings. Claims 1-5 remain in the case.

Voluntary Amendment to the Drawings

Applicant voluntarily amends the drawings in order that the drawings more closely conform to the language used in the specification and claims. In Figures 1, 3, and 4 "general" is replaced with "generic"; In Figures 2, 3, and 4 "special" is replaced with "specific"; In Figure 4 "descriptors" is replaced with "descriptions." Applicant also amends the drawings to correct minor informalities. In Figure 1 the label "protocol descriptions" has been added to make the Figure consistent with Figures 3 and 4. In Figure 4 arrowheads have been added to the protocol descriptions to make the Figure consistent with Figures 1 and 3. No new matter has been added through these amendments.

Objection to Claims 1-4

The Examiner objected to claims 1-4 because of the terms "may be" and "being capable of." Applicant hereby amends claims 1-4, replacing "may be" and "being capable of being" with "is," "are," and "being" as appropriate and rearranges claim 1 for clarity. No new matter has been added through these amendments.

Rejection of Claims 1-5 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yang. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Yang teaches a Protocol Analyzer, Simulator, and Tester ("PAST") for testing network systems. The PAST runs test scripts (PAST Description Languages, or "PDLs") which contain protocol descriptions, network configuration, and test procedures. The PAST includes an IBM compatible personal computer and an HD64180 microprocessor based peripheral controller (PAST Interface Controller, or "PIC"). The Examiner equates the PIC with Applicant's generic

decoder, and equates the personal computer with Applicant's specific controller. Applicant respectfully traverses this conclusion.

The PAST has three distinct operating modes. (Page 100, left column) (1) In "automatic mode," PDLs on the personal computer are compiled into binary form and downloaded to the PIC where they are executed *autonomously*; that is, independent of the personal computer. (Page 97, left column and page 99, right column) (2) In "interactive mode," rather than compiling and downloading the PDLs to the PIC, the personal computer interprets them directly. (Page 97, left column) (3) Likewise, for layer 3 testing the PIC is switched into transparent mode and the PDLs are executed directly on the personal computer. (Page 100, left column) Applicant points out that in each of Yang's three operating modes, the PDLs are executed or interpreted *exclusively* within either the personal computer or the PIC, not a combination of the two.

In contrast, Applicant's invention consists of a generic decoder and a specific decoder operating *in cooperation*: The generic decoder interprets protocol descriptions to provide flexibility for many protocols. For specific protocols which require more efficiency, simplicity, or ease of maintenance than the generic decoder offers, the specific decoder is used instead, thereby *supplementing* the generic decoder. This cooperation between the decoders can be abstracted by the use of element functions: A protocol within the specific decoder can be overlaid and interpreted by the generic decoder.

As Yang decodes protocols *exclusively* within the personal computer or the PIC, and not *cooperation* between the personal computer and the PIC, Yang does not teach or suggest "a generic decoder into which a limited number of protocol descriptions may be loaded, the protocol descriptions being interpreted by the generic decoder; and a specific decoder designed for a certain protocol description, the generic and specific decoders being reversibly connected so that the generic and specific decoders may be updated separately." Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from independent claim 1, and are patentable for that reason alone as well as being patentable in their own right. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

For the reasons discussed above, Yang also fails to teach or suggest "provisioning a generic decoder into which a limited number of protocol descriptions are loaded, the protocol descriptions being interpreted by the generic decoder; provisioning a specific decoder for a

certain protocol description; and reversibly connecting the generic and specific decoders to form the decoding device so that the generic and specific decoders may be updated separately." Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claim 5 depends from independent claim 4, and is patentable for that reason alone as well as being patentable in its own right. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, allowance of claims 1-5 are urged, and such action and the issuance of this case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Wolfgang Bartsch

By: _____

Matthew D. Rabdau
Reg. No. 43,026
(503) 627-5068 (Voice)
(503) 627-7119 (Fax)

9 February 2006
Tektronix, Inc.
P.O. Box 500
Delivery Station 50-LAW
Beaverton, OR 97077

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheets of drawings are formal replacements for all of the drawings previously submitted.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets 1/2 through 2/2